

## Historic Resources Commission Meeting Minutes of March 14, 2007

**Members Present:** Alice Keller, Jackson Bebbler, Rob Moody, John Cram, Scott Riviere, Alice Coppedge, Jay Winer, Diane Duermit, Cheryl McMurry, Suzanne Jones, Lupe Perez

**Members Absent:** Amanda Starcher, Todd Williams, Marsha Shortell

**Staff:** Stacy Merten, Curt Euler, Jennifer Blevins, Nathan Pennington

**Public:** William Gordon, Jennifer Reeder, Bryan Moffitt, Justin Ried, Day Dantzler, Cliff Dobson, Shawn Lynch, Patsy Brison, Tasha Christensen, Mark & Jennifer Harris, Rich German, Chuck Pickering, Eric Diener, Gray Reese, Bryant Baker, George & Teresita Finch

**Call to Order:** Chair Winer called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. with a quorum present.

**Adoption of Minutes:** Commissioner Riviere made a motion to adopt the February, 2007 minutes as written.  
Second by: Commissioner Duermit  
Vote for: All

### Public Hearings:

#### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant :** Joan Aliferis, George Vlahos, Mary Vlahos Craven/  
Kessler Asheville, LLC

**Subject Property:** 11 Lodge Street

**Hearing Date:** March 14, 2007

**Historic District:** Biltmore Village

**PIN:** 9648.19-60-4028, 9648.19-60-3077

**Zoning District:** CB-II

**Other Permits:** Zoning, Building

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She explained the request for flexible development to reduce the required building setbacks. She asked for door specifications.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Justin Ried, the applicant, passed out packets of revised drawings and displayed an annotated site plan. Gray Reese, project architect, reviewed the changes made since the preliminary review. He reviewed the height and setback comparisons between the proposed structure and the adjacent buildings. Mr. Ried displayed material samples, including the

	foundation brick, pebbledash, trim, window, clay roof tiles and paint colors. He explained that the doors would be salvaged or custom built. He said he would consult with staff prior to purchasing or building the doors.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
Chuck Pickering	Spoke in favor of the project.
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
<p>The Commissioners thanked the applicants for their response to the concerns expressed at the preliminary review and also said they were very pleased with the decision to use clay tiles for the roof. There was discussion about the removal of the window on the rear elevation. The Commissioners agreed that the wall would look blank without it. Mr. Reese explained that they could add the window back, but because it was in a bathroom it may not be operable and the Commissioners agreed that would not be a problem.</p>	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
<p><b>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</b></p> <p>Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 12/18/06, including new construction checklist, site plan, architectural site plan, 4 elevations, 3 sheets floor plans, building section, flood line indication, materials comparison and building height comparisons; Exhibit B – historical review memo dated 1/10/07; Exhibit C – application package dated 2/20/07, including new construction checklist, site plan, aerial photograph, architectural site plan, 3 sheets floor plans, 4 elevations, building section, building height comparisons and materials comparisons; Exhibit D – flexible development application dated 3/8/07; Exhibit E – package of revised drawings dated 3/13/07, including 4 elevations indicating height change, building section, first level floor plan, site plan, architectural site plan, 3 sheets building height comparisons and composite site plan; Exhibit F – material samples; Exhibit G – revised drawings and site plan dated 3/14/07; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within the Biltmore Village Historic District and all others within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits H and I.</li> <li>2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.</li> <li>3. Application is to construct a new 2 ½ story structure (39’ 10” tall) with 20 guestrooms and 12 parking spaces as an auxiliary to the previously approved hotel at 47 Hendersonville Road, per attached plans. The new structure will have a brick foundation, pebbledash siding and clay tile</li> </ol>	

roof. Details include: half timbering, cornices, brackets, decorative brick patterns, moldings, corner boards and surrounds. Windows will be wood in various styles including double hung, with diamond muntin pattern on upper sash, fixed with transoms and sidelights and casements. Street trees will be Tulip Poplar per the Biltmore Village guidelines and sidewalks will be “Phoenix” brick in the historic pattern. Apply flexible development to allow front entrance of Buildings to be setback 11’ from back of curb. **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the *Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines* Books 1, & 3 and the *Biltmore Village Development Plan* were used to evaluate this request including the Goals for the Biltmore Village Historic District found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 2, pages 7-8, The General Plan & Character of Biltmore Village found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 4, pages 19-20, Site Design found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 5, pages 23-26 & 32-34, Color found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 7 pages 43-44, Illumination found in Book 1 *General Design Guidelines & Policies*, Chapter 8 pages 45-46, New Construction in Contemporary Styles found in Book 3 *Design Guidelines for New Construction & Additions* Chapter 4, pages 13-15 of the Biltmore Village Historic District Design Guidelines adopted October, 1988 and Proposed Plan and Character of Biltmore Village Chapter 5, pages 53-58 of the *Biltmore Village Development Plan*, May, 1992.

Flexible Development Standards Section 7-11-6 of Unified Development Ordinance were also used to evaluate this application.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. The proposed structure is pedestrian oriented.
2. The proposed structure is compatible with the district in terms of form, scale and materials.
3. The setbacks are compatible with the surrounding buildings.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Biltmore Village Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Jones  
Second by: Commissioner Riviere  
Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued with the following conditions:**

- 1) **the applicant will submit a revised east elevation showing the window change**
- 2) **entry doors will be submitted to staff for review**

Motion by: Commissioner Jones  
Second by: Commissioner Riviere  
Vote for: All

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant :** Terri Deal/William Gordon  
**Subject Property:** 158 Cherokee Road  
**Hearing Date:** March 14, 2007  
**Historic District:** Albemarle Park  
**PIN:** 9649.15-74-3683  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Building

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She expressed concern about the appropriateness of the entry door.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	William Gordon, the contractor, told the Commissioners that he has had difficulty finding a half-glass door to fit the narrow opening. He told the Commissioners that he plans to use true divided light windows instead of the simulated divided light originally proposed as noted in the specifications he submitted just prior to the meeting. He also pointed out that he would use a 12-pane fixed window instead of 2 rectangular double-hung windows.

### Public Comment

<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

### Commission Comments/Discussion

The Commissioners discussed the proposed window changes and determined that they would be appropriate. They also discussed the proposed door. They decided that a door with 6 horizontal panels and no glass would be appropriate and Mr. Gordon agreed.

### Commission Action

#### MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT

Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – preliminary application package dated 2/1/07, including scope of work summary and 2 elevations; Exhibit B – application package dated 2/20/07, including scope of work summary, 3 sheets window specifications, 2 photographs and 2 elevations; Exhibit C – window specifications dated 3/14/07; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;

I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:

1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within the Albemarle Park Historic district and all others within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 28<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits D and E.

2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.

3. Application is to rehabilitate existing accessory structure per attached plans. Replace existing sliding door and large existing non-original windows with three 32" x 54" wood, 6 over 6, double hung, TDL windows and one 48" x 32" stationary TDL picture window. Downstairs front atrium side window will be replaced by a 32" solid wood, 6 horizontal panel door with no windows. Windows and doors will be painted to match windows on "Possum Trot". Left side barrier wall to hide trash can and HVAC system will be sided with square lattice. Right side deck underpinning will be square lattice. Front gutter to be replaced with 6" half round copper gutters. Railroad tie planter on front of cottage will be replaced with a rock wall to match "Possum Trot". **All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.**

4. That the Architectural Design Guidelines and Standards for Albemarle Park were used to evaluate this request. Windows and Doors found on pages 29, Porches Decks and Exterior Stairs found on page 32 and Garages and Outbuildings found on page 34.

5. This application **does** meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:

1. Structure will be made more compatible with the architecture of the district and with the architecture of the main building.

6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness **are** compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Albemarle Park Historic District.

Motion by: Commissioner Duermit

Second by: Commissioner Cram

Vote for: All

Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be **issued**.

Motion by: Commissioner Duermit

Second by: Commissioner Riviere

Vote for: All

#### **Agenda Item**

<b>Owner/Applicant :</b>	Mark & Jennifer Harris
<b>Subject Property:</b>	50 Cumberland Ave.
<b>Hearing Date:</b>	March 14, 2007
<b>Historic District:</b>	Montford
<b>PIN:</b>	9649.17-11-9893
<b>Zoning District:</b>	RM-8
<b>Other Permits:</b>	Building

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She stated that the drawings did not appear to be to scale. She expressed concern about the proportions of the windows. She said the size and orientation of window in the gable was not typical.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Mark Harris, the applicant, said he would change the window sizes to any the Commission deemed appropriate.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
The Commissioners noted that the drawings showed no eaves or corner boards and Mr. Harris said he plans to incorporate details on the accessory structure to match the house. The Commissioners agreed that the placement of the windows and door were appropriate, but the proportions should match those on the main house. They also noted that gable windows are typically smaller than those on the rest of the building. They decided that a 6-panel door with no glass would be appropriate. Ms. Merten stated that it was clear the Commission would issue a CA for a new accessory structure, but they would need accurate and detailed drawings and window and door specifications in order to vote on the proposed project.	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
Commissioner Moody made a motion to continue the hearing until the April 11, 2007 meeting. Second by: Commissioner Bebbber Vote for: All	

#### **Agenda Item**

**Owner/Applicant:** Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints/Rich German  
**Subject Property:** 50 Courtland Ave.  
**Hearing Date:** March 14, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.17-20-7196  
**Zoning District:** RS-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Rich German, the architect, told the Commissioners about the design team's site visit and the changes made since the preliminary review. He displayed revised color elevations. He displayed material samples, including pebbledash and roof shingles and passed out copies of window specifications. Bryant Baker, project manager, explained that the existing roof shingles would be difficult to match so they will be replaced and the whole roof will have new shingles in the color "moiré black."
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	

Commission Comments/Discussion
<p>The Commissioners confirmed that the windows will be simulated divided light. They discussed the texture of the pebbledash and told Mr. Baker that the sample provided was too rough. They suggested that the stones should be rounder. He said he would work with the contractor to create a smoother texture and the Commissioners agreed that Ms. Merten could approve the pebbledash at the site.</p>
Commission Action
<p><b>MOTION TO ADOPT FINDINGS OF FACT</b></p> <p>Mister Chair, based upon the evidence presented to this Commission, including Exhibit A – application package dated 1/23/07, including 4 photographs, 4 proposed elevations, proposed floor plan and proposed site plan; Exhibit B - application package dated 3/7/07, including summary of changes, 4 elevations and site plan; Exhibit C – roof shingle sample; Exhibit D – pebbledash sample; Exhibit E – color rendering; Exhibit F – window specifications; and the Commission’s actual inspection and review of subject property by all members;</p> <p>I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS OF FACT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That notice of public hearing on this application was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2007, and that each owner of real property situated within two hundred feet of the subject property were notified of this hearing in the mail on the 31<sup>st</sup> day of January, 2007 as indicated by Exhibits G and H.</li> <li>2. That at this hearing the applicant and affected property owners were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence as well as submit questions to each other, the Historic Resources Commission staff and Commission members.</li> <li>3. Application is to construct 3,865 sq. ft. chapel addition to existing church structure and add 12 spaces to parking lot. Addition will be of brick construction to match the original building with stucco quoins and pebbledash accents, brick pilasters and metal gutters and downspouts. Windows will be aluminum with muntin pattern to match existing and will have pre-cast concrete headers and sills. Roof on existing structure and addition will have “black moiré” asphalt shingles. Site will have additional landscaping to meet current UDO requirements, per attached plans. <b>All permits, variances, or approvals as required by law must be obtained before work may commence.</b></li> <li>4. That the guidelines for Additions to Buildings in the Montford Historic District found on page 55, the guidelines for Vegetation: Trees found on page 50 and the guidelines for New Construction: Monumental Buildings found on page 66 in <i>The Design Review Guidelines for the Montford Historic District</i> adopted on December 8, 1999, were used to evaluate this request.</li> </ol> <p><b>ADDITIONS TO BUILDINGS IN THE MONTFORD HISTORIC DISTRICT</b></p> <p>Wherever possible, new additions to Montford buildings shall be done in such a manner that if they were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the original building would not be impaired. New addition design for both contributing and non-contributing buildings shall be compatible with the size, scale, color, material and character of the neighborhood, the building and its environment. The Historic Resources Commission has adopted the following standards for the construction of additions to historic buildings:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Additions should be located as inconspicuously as possible, preferably on rear elevations. Additions on the front elevation will not be allowed.</li> <li>2. Additions must be compatible with the original buildings in terms of size, scale, color, materials, and character.</li> </ol>

<p>3. Roof forms are particularly important in blending additions with original buildings.</p> <p>4. Windows in additions should be similar to those in the original buildings in their proportions, spacing, and materials.</p> <p>5. Additions cannot be taller than the original buildings.</p> <p>6. Foundations and eaves or other major horizontal elements, should generally align on buildings and their additions.</p> <p><b>Vegetation: Trees</b>  The mature tree canopy found in the Montford Historic District is one of the strongest unifying elements of the District. Property owners are encouraged to maintain and protect this existing tree canopy and to continually plant new trees and shrubbery as replacements for diseased or dying trees and shrubbery.  There are many mature, healthy hardwood or deciduous trees in the neighborhood, often along front property lines or in front yards. Evergreens and conifers have generally been used as side yard borders or as ornamentals.  Maintenance of the existing canopy of mature trees along streets and in front yards is a high priority. New construction should be sighted to minimize its impact on existing mature trees and their root systems, both on and adjacent to the construction site.  Tree Commission Response Team will recommend if a tree larger than 6 inches in diameter may be removed. Tree removal within the City's right-of-way is regulated by the Asheville Tree Commission. Contact HRC at 259 - 5836 to arrange a site visit by the Tree Commission Response Team.</p> <p><b>New Construction: Monumental Buildings</b>  Some structures historically have a special or unique form because of the nature of their use. Examples include but are not limited to Church sanctuaries, governmental and civic buildings, schools or institutions of higher learning, theatres, and museums.  Proposed monumental buildings may draw guidance from Asheville's rich architectural heritage of historic monumental buildings. Few, if any, locations within the Montford Historic District remain which are suitable for new construction of monumental structures. Such structures shall comply with the following standards. New construction of monumental buildings should be visually compatible with existing historic structures to which they are visually related in terms of:  Height of the proposed structure shall be measured from either the sidewalk elevation or ground level of the principal facade. The new proposed building may not be more than 25% taller than the tallest structure within 100 feet of the proposed building in the Montford Historic District;  Relationship of the width of the structure to the height of the structure;  Relationship of the width and height of the windows and doors;  Relationship of the solids to voids in the front facade;  Rhythm of the structures on the street (the relationship of the structure to the open space between it and adjoining structures);  Rhythm of entrances and porch projections;  Relationship of materials, texture, and color;  Roof shape;  The size of a structure, the structural mass and components that make up the exterior.  Every attempt shall be made to retain existing site features such as trees, stone walls, shrubbery, fences, etc. Reshaping land contours with earthmoving equipment will be strongly discouraged. If proof exists showing original land contours, the existing land contours may be changed to reflect original conditions.</p> <p>5. This application <b>does</b> meet the design guidelines for the following reasons:</p>	<p>1. The applicant has made an effort to integrate a non-contributing structure into the neighborhood.</p>
<p>6. That the action and improvements proposed in the application before us for a Certificate of Appropriateness <b>are</b> compatible with the historic aspects and character of the Montford Historic District.</p> <p>Motion by: Commissioner Keller  Second by: Commissioner Moody  Vote for: Commissioners Keller, Moody, Duermit, Cram, Jones, McMurry, Riviere, Bebbber and Chair Winer  Vote against: Commissioner Coppedge</p> <p>Based upon the foregoing FINDINGS OF FACT and for the reasons set forth therein, I move that a Certificate of Appropriateness be <b>issued with the following condition:</b>  <b>Staff will approve pebbledash texture and color at the site.</b></p> <p>Motion by: Commissioner Keller  Second by: Commissioner McMurry  Vote for: Commissioners Keller, Moody, Duermit, Cram, Jones, McMurry, Riviere, Bebbber and Chair Winer  Vote against: Commissioner Coppedge</p>	



### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant :** Jody Kuhne  
**Subject Property:** 76 Starnes Avenue  
**Hearing Date:** March 14, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.18-21-5940  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Subdivision Approval

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten explained that there are zoning issues that should be resolved before the project is reviewed. She told the Commissioners that she had recommended a continuance to the applicant and he concurred.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	None
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
None	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
Commissioner Duermit made a motion to continue the hearing until the April 11, 2007 meeting. Second by: Commissioner Riviere Vote for: All	

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant :** Douglas Smith  
**Subject Property:** 117 Flint Street  
**Hearing Date:** March 14, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.17-22-4440  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Building

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten told the Commissioners that the applicant was not present at the meeting and suggested that the hearing be continued.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	None
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
None	
<b>Commission Action</b>	

Commissioner Duermit made a motion to continue the hearing until the April 11, 2007 meeting.  
Second by: Commissioner Moody  
Vote for: All

## Preliminary Reviews:

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant :** Historic Biltmore Village, LLC/Hill Partners  
**Subject Property:** 2 Swann Street  
**Hearing Date:** March 14, 2007  
**Historic District:** Biltmore Village  
**PIN:** 9647.07-69-9908  
**Zoning District:** CB-2  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She said that a site plan, window and door specifications and paint and roof colors would be required for the final review.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Bryan Moffitt, project architect, explained that the drawings given to the Commission members are preliminary drawings that indicate the look and feel of the project and that detailed and scaled information will be presented with the final submittal. Mr. Moffitt pointed out that the renovation sought to use the current openings in the brick façade and that the windows in the current elevation had different widths. He said that if revisions to the parking area are such that new walks are required, the new walks will be brick. He told the Commission that the trees shown on the proposed design were new and that the total extent of the landscaping would depend on the extent of site revisions.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
Commissioner Coppedge expressed concern that the window pattern was uneven in that the drawing showed three windows on one side and two windows on the other. Commissioner Cram commented that the buildings in Biltmore Village possess a rhythm in the front façades and that the design team should try to create a similar rhythm on this façade. One of the Commissioners commented that the proposed gable did a nice job of drawing the eye to the entrance and creating its own order and rhythm along the front façade.	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
None	

Commissioner Perez entered the meeting room at 5:50 p.m.

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant :** Elizabeth Graham/Eric Diener  
**Subject Property:** Houston Street  
**Hearing Date:** March 14, 2007  
**Historic District:** Montford  
**PIN:** 9649.17-01-4485  
**Zoning District:** RM-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed an aerial photograph of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She expressed concerns about the proposed setback from the front of the lot, the glass block, window proportions, muntin patterns, front door style, diagonal lattice and gable and bay window roof forms.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Eric Diener, the applicant, told the Commissioners that the glass block and the lattice have been eliminated from the plan. He explained that if the house is set further back on the lot, the topography would cause a large span of the foundation to be exposed and he hopes to avoid that problem.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
<p>The Commissioners suggested that the house would blend in with the neighborhood better if the bay window was replaced with a square bump-out. They said Mr. Diener would need to find a precedent in the district for the bay window and the transoms in order for them to approve those elements. Commissioner Riviere pointed out that the difference in setbacks between the proposed house and the surrounding houses may not be an issue because of the difference in the lot elevations. Most of the Commissioners felt that the design of the front door should be simpler. There was discussion about the roof returns and it was decided that they were appropriate to the design of the house. Commissioner Bebbber suggested the addition of porch brackets.</p>	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
None	

Commissioners Duermit and McMurry left the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

### Agenda Item

**Owner/Applicant :** ELCO Properties/EcoBuilders, Inc., Rob Moody  
**Subject Property:** 84 St. Dunstan's Road  
**Hearing Date:** March 14, 2007  
**Historic District:** St. Dunstan's  
**PIN:** 9648.19-51-2792  
**Zoning District:** RS-8  
**Other Permits:** Building & Zoning

<b>Staff Comments</b>	Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed the staff report. She noted her concerns, including the atypical fenestration, the parking location in the front of the structure and the exposed metal chimney.
<b>Applicant(s) or Applicant Representative(s)</b>	Rob Moody, the contractor, passed out and displayed drawings, including a storyboard, revised elevations, and information on the exterior lighting fixtures and ceramic tile. He explained that the house was designed to be sensitive to the topography of the lot. He said the intention is to limit the soil disturbance and stated that the steepness of the slope prohibits the installation of a drive to the rear of the house.
<b>Public Comment</b>	
<b>Speaker Name</b>	<b>Issue(s)</b>
None	
<b>Commission Comments/Discussion</b>	
Commissioner Coppedge said the design of the house looks extremely modern and others agreed. Several Commissioners expressed concerns about the windows, including the modern style, small size, atypical placement and lack of muntins. They were also concerned about the parking deck. They discussed several possible ways to soften the look of the deck and it was suggested that Mr. Moody should try to make it look more organic. They also noted that even though the street is very narrow and the occupant would not be able to park on the street in front of the house, providing off-street parking is not required. It was pointed out that the guidelines state that exposed metal chimneys “shall not be allowed” and that parking “shall not be located in the front yard.” The Commissioners said that Mr. Moody should explain how the proposed structure fits in with the district when he returns for a final review.	
<b>Commission Action</b>	
None	

### **Other Business:**

#### **a) Public hearing on landmark designation for the Richard Sharp Smith house**

Ms. Merten showed slides of the subject property and reviewed some information about R.S. Smith and his contribution to the architecture of our area. Commissioner Coppedge asked whether the outbuildings and the entire parcel of land were included in the designation. Ms. Merten replied that the land immediately surrounding a landmark is usually included in the designation so that any new construction would undergo design review. The Commissioners discussed the outbuildings and agreed that they should not be included since they are non-contributing structures. Mr. George Finch, the property owner, told the Commissioners that the original stone spring cap is still in existence, but that it needs repair. Ms. Merten suggested that the designation report could be rewritten to include the spring.

## MOTION OF RECOMMENDATION

Mister Chair, I move that this Commission adopt the following FINDINGS:

1. That notice of a public hearing on this designation was published in the Asheville Citizen-Times on the 28th day of February, 2007, and that all owners of real property situated within 200 feet were notified of this hearing by mail on the 28th day of February, 2007.
2. That at this hearing, the applicant and the public were all given the opportunity to offer oral and documentary evidence to the Historic Resources Commission members.
3. The Richard Sharp Smith House is located at 655 Chunns Cove Road.
4. The designation includes the exterior of the house and the 2.4 acre lot on which it is located, excluding the outbuildings. Interior features included in the designation are the rough-hewn cedar front doors, interior doors with diagonal panels, and fireplaces in the living/dining room and the first story bedroom.
5. The Richard Sharp Smith House, with a period of significance from 1902-1924 is significant as the home of Richard Sharp Smith during his productive years as one of Asheville's most influential architects and as an important embodiment of Smith's personal architectural style.
6. Richard Sharp Smith was born and trained in architecture in England. He came to Asheville as the supervising architect for George Vanderbilt's Biltmore Estate in 1889, as an employee of Richard Morris Hunt. Smith also designed additional buildings for Vanderbilt, including many buildings in Biltmore Village. Following Hunt's death in 1895, Smith established his own practice and earned a reputation for his distinctive English-influenced Craftsman and period revival style residential designs, many of which were built in Montford. Smith went on to become one of Asheville's most prominent and prolific architects.
7. The structure is a 1½ story side gable dwelling of stone masonry construction bearing the hallmarks of Smith's unique design sensibility. The foundation and exterior walls are constructed of un-coursed, dry-stacked stone. A front gable bay projects from the façade and opens onto an uncovered concrete terrace. Gable ends are faced with pebbledash stucco and feature decorative brackets.
8. Based upon the foregoing reasons, the Historic Resources Commission of Asheville and Buncombe County deems and finds that the Richard Sharp Smith House **is** significant in terms of its special historical, architectural or cultural significance; that the structure **does** possess integrity of design, setting, workmanship, materials, feeling, and/or association. Based upon the foregoing, the Historic Resources Commission recommends that the Asheville City Council **adopt** an ordinance designating the Richard Sharp Smith House, as a local historic landmark.

Motion by: Commissioner Riviere

Second by: Commissioner Duermit

Vote for: All

**b) Sondley Award**

The nominees were Grace Pless, Jim Coman and Mary Jo Brezny. Having the majority of votes, Mary Jo Brezny was selected as the Sondley Award recipient for 2007.

**c) Report on site visit to Acton United Methodist Church Cemetery**

Ms. Merten and Commissioner Cram stated that it appeared most of the burials postdate 1940. They said they didn't see any distinguishing headstones or architecture and were not aware of any persons of local importance buried in the cemetery. One of the Commissioners asked why the church asked for landmark designation and Ms. Merten replied that they want to protect the cemetery from development. It was decided that the cemetery doesn't have special significance to make it worthy of landmark status and that, as the owner, the church determines whether or not the property can be developed.

**d)** Curt Euler told the Commissioners that he will be going before City Council in April with proposed changes to the zoning ordinance, including higher fines for violations of the design review guidelines. The Commissioners were very much in favor of the higher penalties.

Chair Winer adjourned the meeting at 8:05 p.m.